1	As argued in Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, the federal judges in the District of
2	Nevada, including the undersigned, have consistently held that the inherent conflict
3	resulting from a plaintiff's allegations pursuing an opt-in collective action under the Fair
4	Labor Standards Act, while at the same time pursuing a parallel opt-out Rule 23 class action
5	claim, warrants dismissal or severance of the state class action claims for relief. See Phelps
6	v. MC Communication, Inc., et al, No. 2:11-cv-423-PMP-LRL Order (Doc. #35) (D. Nev.
7	August 1, 2011). The Court will therefore grant Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs'
8	Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claims for Relief without prejudice to pursue said Class
9	Action Claims in State Court.
10	The Court finds further, however, that Plaintiffs have set forth plausible FLSA
11	claims in their first two Claims for Relief.
12	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Docs # 8
13	& #10) are GRANTED as to Plaintiffs' Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claims for Relief, but
14	DENIED as to Plaintiffs' First and Second Claims for Relief under the Fair Labor
15	Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 & 207.
16	DATED: March 5, 2012.
17	
18	$\bigcirc$ $\bigcirc$ $\bigcirc$ $\bigcirc$ $\bigcirc$ $\bigcirc$
19	PHILIP M. PRO
20	United States District Judge
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	